

# A SIMULTANEOUS GENERALIZATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND DISJOINTNESS IN BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

COREY T. BRUNS

**ABSTRACT.** We give a definition of some classes of boolean algebras generalizing free boolean algebras; they satisfy a universal property that certain functions extend to homomorphisms. We give a combinatorial property of generating sets of these algebras, which we call  $n$ -independent. The properties of these classes ( $n$ -free and  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras) are investigated. These include connections to hypergraph theory and cardinal invariants on these algebras. Related cardinal functions,  $i_n$ , the minimum size of a maximal  $n$ -independent subset and  $i_\omega$ , the minimum size of an  $\omega$ -independent subset, are introduced and investigated. The values of  $i_n$  and  $i_\omega$  on  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$  are shown to be independent of ZFC.

## 1. DEFINITIONS

A boolean algebra  $A$  is free over its subset  $X$  if it has the universal property that every function  $f$  from  $X$  to a boolean algebra  $B$  extends to a unique homomorphism. This is equivalent to requiring that  $X$  be independent and generate  $A$  (uniqueness). A generalization,  $\perp$ -free, is introduced in Heindorf [5], and some of its properties are dealt with. I follow his notation for some of its properties, but that of Koppelberg [6] for the operations  $+$ ,  $\cdot$ ,  $-$ ,  $0$ ,  $1$  on Boolean Algebras, with the addition that for an element  $a$  of a boolean algebra, we let  $a^0 = -a$  and  $a^1 = a$ . An elementary product of  $X$  is an element of the form  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x}$  where  $R$  is a finite subset of  $X$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ . We further generalize the notion of freeness to  $n$ -freeness for  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ .

It is nice to have a symbol for disjointness; we define  $a \perp b$  if and only if  $a \cdot b = 0$ .

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $n$  be a positive integer,  $A$  and  $B$  be nontrivial boolean algebras, and  $U \subseteq A$ . A function  $f : U \rightarrow B$  is  $n$ -preserving if and only if for every  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \in U$ ,  $\prod_{i < n} a_i = 0$  implies that  $\prod_{i < n} f(a_i) = 0$ .

An infinite version of this is also important.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nontrivial boolean algebras, and  $U \subseteq A$ . A function  $f : U \rightarrow B$  is  $\omega$ -preserving if and only if for every finite  $H \subseteq U$ ,  $\prod H = 0$  implies that  $\prod f[H] = 0$ .

Then we say that  $A$  is  $n$ -free over  $X$  if every  $n$ -preserving function from  $X$  into arbitrary  $B$  extends to a unique homomorphism. The uniqueness just requires that  $X$  be a generating set for  $A$ .

The existence of such extensions is equivalent to an algebraic property of  $X$ , namely that  $X^+$  is  $n$ -independent. This notion is defined below, and the equivalence is proved. (For  $n = 1$ , this is the usual notion of free and independent; for  $n = 2$ ,

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03G05; Secondary: 03E17.

*Key words and phrases.* boolean algebra, independence, delta system, forcing.

the notions are called  $\perp$ -free and  $\perp$ -independent by Heindorf [5]; Theorem 1.3 in the same paper shows that a 2-free boolean algebra has a 2-independent generating set. We differ from Heindorf in that he allows 0 to be an element of a  $\perp$ -independent set.) Since any function that is  $n$ -preserving is also  $m$ -preserving for all  $m \leq n \leq \omega$ , so that an  $m$ -free boolean algebra is also  $n$ -free over the same set; in particular, any  $n$ -free boolean algebra is  $\omega$ -free. It's also worth noting that a function is  $\omega$ -preserving if and only if it's  $n$ -preserving for all finite  $n$ .

Freeness over  $X$  implies that no elementary products over  $X$  can be 0.  $n$ -independence weakens this by allowing products of  $n$  or fewer elements of  $X$  to be 0. This requires some other elementary products to be 0 as well—if  $x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m = 0$ , then any elementary product that includes  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  each with exponent 1 must also be 0.

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $A$  be a boolean algebra. For  $n$  a positive integer,  $X \subseteq A$  is  $n$ -independent if and only if  $0 \notin X$  and for all nonempty finite subsets  $F$  and  $G$  of  $X$ , the following three conditions hold:

- ( $\perp 1$ ):  $\sum F \neq 1$ .
- ( $\perp 2$ ) <sub>$n$</sub> : If  $\prod F = 0$ , there is an  $F' \subseteq F$  with  $|F'| \leq n$  such that  $\prod F' = 0$ .
- ( $\perp 3$ ): If  $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$ , then  $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$ .

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $A$  be a boolean algebra.  $X \subseteq A$  is  $\omega$ -independent if and only if  $0 \notin X$  and for all nonempty finite subsets  $F$  and  $G$  of  $X$ , the following two conditions hold:

- ( $\perp 1$ ):  $\sum F \neq 1$ .
- ( $\perp 3$ ): If  $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$ , then  $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$ .

We note that in both the above definitions, if  $X$  is infinite, then ( $\perp 3$ )  $\Rightarrow$  ( $\perp 1$ ); suppose ( $\perp 1$ ) fails; take a finite  $G$  with  $\sum G = 1$ , then take some  $x \notin G$  and let  $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x\}$ ; then  $0 < \prod F \leq \sum G$  and  $F \cap G = \emptyset$ .

( $\perp 3$ ) has several equivalent forms which will be useful in the sequel.

**Proposition 1.5.** *The following are equivalent for a subset of  $X$  of a boolean algebra  $A$ :*

- (1) For all nonempty finite  $F, G \subseteq X$ , ( $\perp 3$ ).
- (2) For all nonempty finite  $F, G \subseteq X$  such that  $F \cap G = \emptyset$  and  $\prod F \neq 0$ ,  $\prod F \not\leq \sum G$ .
- (3) For all nonempty finite  $F, G \subseteq X$  such that  $F \cap G = \emptyset$  and  $\prod F \neq 0$ ,  $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$ , where  $-G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{-g : g \in G\}$ .
- (4) Let  $X$  be bijectively enumerated by  $I$  such that  $X = \{x_i : i \in I\}$ . For all nonempty finite  $R \subseteq I$  and all  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $1 \in \text{rng } \varepsilon$  and  $\prod_{\substack{i \in R \\ \varepsilon_i = 1}} x_i \neq 0$ ,  $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$ .

In words, the final equivalent says that no elementary product of elements of  $X$  is 0 unless the product of the non-complemented elements is 0. We note that in the presence of ( $\perp 2$ ) <sub>$n$</sub> , the words “of  $n$ ” may be inserted after “product.”

*Proof.* We begin by pointing out that ( $\perp 3$ ) has two hypotheses,  $0 \neq \prod F$  and  $\prod F \leq \sum G$ . Thus the contrapositive of ( $\perp 3$ ) is “If  $F \cap G = \emptyset$ , then  $0 = \prod F$  or  $\prod F \not\leq \sum G$ ,” which is equivalent to (2).

(2) and (3) are equivalent by some elementary facts:  $a \leq b \iff a \cdot -b = 0$  and de Morgan's law that  $-\sum G = \prod -G$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4):

Assume (3) and the hypotheses of (4). If  $\text{rng } \varepsilon = \{1\}$ , the conclusion is clear. Otherwise, let  $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x_i : i \in R \text{ and } \varepsilon_i = 0\}$ . Then (3) implies that  $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$ , as we wanted.

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (3):

Assume (4) and the hypotheses of (3). Let  $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in I : x_i \in F \cup G\}$  and let  $\varepsilon_i = 1$  if  $x_i \in F$  and  $\varepsilon_i = 0$  otherwise. Then (4) implies that  $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$ , as we wanted.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.6.** *The following are equivalent for a subset  $X$  of a boolean algebra  $A$ :*

- (1)  $X$  is  $\omega$ -independent
- (2) Let  $X$  be bijectively enumerated by  $I$  such that  $X = \{x_i : i \in I\}$ . For all nonempty finite  $R \subseteq I$  and all  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $\prod_{\substack{i \in R \\ \varepsilon_i = 1}} x_i \neq 0$ ,  $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of proposition 1.5.  $(\perp 1)$  is taken care of since products over an empty index set are taken to be 1 by definition.  $\square$

In the same spirit, we have an equivalent definition of  $n$ -independent.

**Proposition 1.7.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer or  $\omega$ ,  $A$  a nontrivial boolean algebra and  $X \subseteq A^+$ .  $X$  is  $n$ -independent if and only if for every  $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$  and every  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ , if  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$  then there is an  $R' \subseteq R$  with  $|R'| \leq n$  such that  $\varepsilon[R'] = \{1\}$  and  $\prod R' = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $n = \omega$ , this is part of proposition 1.6.

Let  $n$  be a positive integer,  $A$  a boolean algebra, and  $X \subseteq A^+$ .

We first show that  $n$ -independent sets have the indicated property.

Assume that  $X$  is  $n$ -independent; take  $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ . Let  $F = \{x \in R : \varepsilon_x = 1\}$  and  $G = \{x \in R : \varepsilon_x = 0\}$ .  $F \neq \emptyset$ ; otherwise  $\sum R = -\prod R = 1$ , contradicting  $(\perp 1)$ . Since  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod F \cdot \prod -G$ , we have that  $\prod F \leq \sum G$ . If  $G = \emptyset$ , then  $\sum G = 0$  and so  $\prod F = 0$  as well. If  $G \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\prod F = 0$  since  $F \cap G = \emptyset$ , using  $(\perp 3)$ . Then  $R'$  is found by  $(\perp 2)_n$ . Now we show that sets with the indicated property are  $n$ -independent.

Assume that  $X$  has the indicated condition and  $F, G \in [X]^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ . We have three conditions to check.

- $(\perp 1)$ : Suppose that  $\sum F = 1$ . We let  $F$  be the set  $R$  in the condition, setting  $\varepsilon_x = 0$  for all  $x \in F$ . Then  $\prod_{x \in F} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod -F = -\sum F = 0$  and  $\{x \in F : \varepsilon_x = 1\} = \emptyset$ , thus there is no  $R'$  as in the condition, since products over an empty index set are equal to 1.
- $(\perp 2)_n$ : Suppose that  $\prod F = 0$ . Again we let  $F$  be the set  $R$  in the condition, this time setting  $\varepsilon_x = 1$  for all  $x \in F$ . Then the condition gives us the necessary  $F'$
- $(\perp 3)$ : Suppose that  $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$  and  $F \cap G = \emptyset$ . Let  $R = F \cup G$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  be such that  $\varepsilon[F] = \{1\}$  and  $\varepsilon[G] = \{0\}$ . Then  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$  and the condition gives  $\prod F = 0$ , which contradicts the original supposition.

$\square$

**Lemma 1.8.** *If  $H$  is an  $\omega$ -independent set that has no finite subset  $F$  such that  $\prod F = 0$ ,  $H$  is in fact independent. Furthermore, if  $H$  is  $n$ -independent with no subset  $F$  of size  $n$  or less with  $\prod F = 0$ , then  $H$  is independent.*

*Proof.* We only need show that  $(\perp 2)_1$  holds, which it does vacuously.  $\square$

2-independence, and thus  $n$ -independence for  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ , is also a generalization of pairwise disjointness on infinite sets.

**Theorem 1.9.** *If  $X \subseteq B^+$  is an infinite pairwise disjoint set, then  $X$  is 2-independent.*

*Proof.* This is clear from proposition 1.7.  $\square$

Some non-trivial examples of 2-free boolean algebras are the finite-cofinite algebras. For infinite  $\kappa$ , let  $A = \text{FinCo}(\kappa)$ .  $\text{At}(A)$  is a 2-independent generating set for  $A$ .

Having an  $n$ -independent generating set is equivalent to  $n$ -freeness. This is known in Koppelberg [6] for  $n = 1$  and Heindorf [5] for  $n = 2$ . Our proof is more elementary than that of Heindorf [5] in that it avoids clone theory.

**Theorem 1.10.** *If  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free over  $X$ , then  $X^+$  is  $\omega$ -independent.*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  and  $X$  be as in the hypothesis; we show that  $X^+$  is  $\omega$ -independent.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $0 \notin X$  so that  $X^+ = X$ .

$(\perp 1)$ : Let  $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be such that  $f[X] = \{0\}$ . Clearly  $f$  is  $\omega$ -preserving and thus extends to a homomorphism  $\bar{f}$ . Take  $F \in [X]^{<\omega}$ ; then  $\bar{f}(\sum F) = \sum f[F] = 0$ , so that  $\sum F \neq 1$ .

$(\perp 3)$ : Take  $F, G \in [X]^{<\omega}$  such that  $F \cap G = \emptyset$  and  $\prod F \neq 0$ . Let  $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be such that  $f[F] = \{1\}$  and  $f[X \setminus F] = \{0\}$ . We claim that  $f$  is  $\omega$ -preserving. If  $H \subseteq X$  is finite such that  $\prod f[H] \neq 0$ , then it must be that  $H \subseteq F$ , and hence  $\prod H \neq 0$ . Thus  $f$  extends to a homomorphism  $\bar{f}$ . Then

$$\bar{f}\left(\prod F \cdot \prod -G\right) = \prod f[F] \cdot \prod \bar{f}[-G] = 1,$$

and so  $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.11.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer and  $A$  a boolean algebra. If  $A$  is  $n$ -free over  $X$ , then  $X^+$  is  $n$ -independent.*

*Proof.* Again, without loss of generality  $X = X^+$ .

From theorem 1.10,  $X$  is  $\omega$ -independent, so we need only show that  $(\perp 2)_n$  holds for  $X$ . We do this by contradiction; assume that  $F \subseteq X$  is finite, of cardinality greater than  $n$ ,  $\prod F = 0$ , and every subset  $F' \subseteq F$  where  $F'$  is of size  $n$  is such that  $\prod F' \neq 0$ .

Define  $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by letting  $f[F] = \{1\}$  and  $f[X \setminus F] = \{0\}$ .

Then  $f$  is  $n$ -preserving. Let  $G \subseteq X$  be of size  $n$  and have  $\prod G = 0$ . Then  $G \not\subseteq F$ , so some  $x \in G$  has  $f(x) = 0$ , so  $\prod f[G] = 0$ . Thus  $f$  must extend to a homomorphism, but then  $f(0) = f(\prod F) = \prod f[F] = \prod \{1\} = 1$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.12.** *Let  $A$  be generated by its  $\omega$ -independent subset  $X$ . Then  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free over  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be an  $\omega$ -preserving function with domain  $X$ ; we will show that  $f$  extends to a unique homomorphism.

Take a finite  $H \subseteq X$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^H 2$  such that  $\prod_{h \in H} h^{\varepsilon_h} = 0$ . Then by  $(\perp 3)$  and  $(\perp 1)$ ,  $\prod_{\varepsilon_h=1} h = 0$ . Then since  $f$  is  $\omega$ -preserving,  $\prod_{\varepsilon_h=1} f(h) = 0$  and thus  $\prod_{h \in H} f(h)^{\varepsilon_h} = 0$ . Thus by Sikorski's extension criterion,  $f$  extends to a homomorphism.

Uniqueness is clear as  $X$  is a generating set.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.13.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer. If  $X$  generates  $A$  and  $X$  is  $n$ -independent, then  $A$  is  $n$ -free over  $X$*

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be an  $n$ -preserving function with domain  $X$ .

Take any distinct  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^k 2$  such that  $\prod_{i < k} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$ .

Then by proposition 1.7, there is an  $F' \subseteq \{x_i : \varepsilon_i = 1 \text{ and } i < k\}$  such that  $|F'| \leq n$  and  $\prod F' = 0$ . Since  $f$  is  $n$ -preserving, it must be that  $\prod f[F'] = 0$ , and thus  $\prod_{i < k} f(x_i)^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$ . Thus, by Sikorski's extension criterion,  $f$  extends to a homomorphism.

Uniqueness is clear as  $X$  is a generating set.  $\square$

So we have shown that the universal algebraic property defining  $n$ -free boolean algebras is equivalent to having an  $n$ -independent generating set.

**Theorem 1.14.**  *$\omega$ -free boolean algebras (and thus all  $n$ -free boolean algebras) are semigroup algebras.*

A semigroup algebra is a boolean algebra that has a generating set that includes  $\{0, 1\}$ , is closed under the product operation, and is disjunctive when 0 is removed.

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be  $\omega$ -free over  $G$ . Then let  $H'$  be the closure of  $G \cup \{0, 1\}$  under finite products, that is, the set of all finite products of elements of  $G$ , along with 0 and 1. Clearly  $H'$  generates  $A$ , includes  $\{0, 1\}$ , and is closed under products, so all that remains is to show that  $H = H' \setminus \{0\}$  is disjunctive. From proposition 2.1 of Monk [8],  $H$  is disjunctive if and only if for every  $M \subseteq H$  there is a homomorphism  $f$  from  $\langle H \rangle$  into  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  such that  $f(h) = M \downarrow h$  for all  $h \in H$ .

To this end, given  $M \subseteq H$ , let  $f : G \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)$  be defined by  $g \mapsto M \downarrow g$ . We claim that  $f$  is  $\omega$ -preserving. Suppose  $G' \in [G]^{<\omega}$  is such that  $\prod G' = 0$ . Then  $\prod_{g \in G'} f(g) = \bigcap_{g \in G'} (M \downarrow g) = \{a \in M : \forall g \in G' [a \leq g]\} = \emptyset$ . So  $f$  extends to a unique homomorphism  $\hat{f}$  from  $A$  to  $\mathcal{P}(M)$ . If  $h \in H \setminus \{1\}$ , then  $h = g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n$  where each  $g_i \in G$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(h) &= \hat{f}(g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n) = f(g_1) \cap f(g_2) \cap \dots \cap f(g_n) = \\ &= (M \downarrow g_1) \cap (M \downarrow g_2) \cap \dots \cap (M \downarrow g_n) = M \downarrow (g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n) = M \downarrow h. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,  $\hat{f}(1) = M = M \downarrow 1$ . Thus  $H$  is disjunctive and  $A$  is a semigroup algebra over  $H'$ .  $\square$

## 2. HYPERGRAPHS AND THEIR ANTICLIQUE ALGEBRAS

There is a correspondence with hypergraphs for  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras. We recall that a hypergraph is a pair  $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$  where  $V$  is called the vertex set, and  $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  is called the hyperedge set; an element of  $E$  is called a hyperedge. We will insist on loopless hypergraphs, that is,  $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus [V]^{\leq 1}$ . A hypergraph is  $n$ -uniform if  $E \subseteq [V]^n$ . For a given hypergraph, we call a set  $A \subseteq V$  an anticlique

if it includes no hyperedges; that is, for all  $e \in E$ ,  $e \setminus A \neq \emptyset$ , and call the set of anticliques  $A(\mathcal{G})$ . Given a hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$ , we define an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(A(\mathcal{G}))$ . For  $v \in V$ , let  $v_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \in A\}$ , which is an element of  $\mathcal{P}(A(\mathcal{G}))$ , and for a set  $H$  of vertices,  $H_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v_+ : v \in H\}$ . We then define the anticlique algebra of  $\mathcal{G}$  as  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle V_+ \rangle$ .

We do not consider cliques in general hypergraphs; it's not clear which way to define them. For an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph, a clique may be non-controversially defined as a set  $C$  where  $[C]^n \subseteq E$ , but for a hypergraph with hyperedges of different cardinalities, it is not clear how many hyperedges must be included in a clique. This difficulty stems from a lack of a reasonable way to define "complement hypergraph." A few possibilities for the hyperedge set of  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$  are  $\mathcal{P}(G) \setminus E$ ,  $[G]^{<\omega} \setminus E$ , and  $[G]^{\leq(\sup_{e \in E}(|e|))} \setminus E$ . For an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\langle G, E \rangle$ , the complementary hypergraph is  $\langle G, [G]^n \setminus E \rangle$ , and then a clique in  $\mathcal{G}$  is an anticlique in  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ . Each possible definition for complement hypergraph results in a different definition for clique, all of which are more complicated than our definition of anticlique. Since anticliques suffice for our study, we do not choose a side on what a clique ought to be.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For any hypergraph  $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$  is  $\omega$ -free over  $V_+$ .*

*Proof.* We need only show that  $V_+$  is  $\omega$ -independent; we will use proposition 1.7.

Suppose that  $R \in [V]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ , and  $\bigcap_{v \in R} v_+^{\varepsilon_v} = \emptyset$ . Let  $S = \{v \in R : \varepsilon_v = 1\}$ . If  $\bigcap_{v \in S} v_+ \neq \emptyset$ , let  $T$  be a member of  $\bigcap_{v \in S} v_+$ . So then  $T$  is an anticlique, and  $S \subseteq T$ . We note that clearly every subset of an anticlique is again an anticlique, so  $S$  is also an anticlique, and  $S \in \bigcap_{v \in R} v_+^{\varepsilon_v}$ .  $\square$

If the hypergraph is somewhat special, we have more:

**Theorem 2.2.** *For any hypergraph  $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$  where  $E \subseteq [V]^{\leq n}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$  is  $n$ -free.*

*Proof.* We show that  $V_+$  is  $n$ -independent.

From the previous theorem, we need only show that  $(\perp 2)_n$  holds for  $V_+$ . Let  $F$  be a finite subset of  $V$  such that  $\prod F_+ = 0$ . Using the observation that  $\prod F_+$  is the set of anticliques that include  $F$ ,  $F$  is not an anticlique. Thus some hyperedge  $e$  is a subset of  $F$ . Then  $\prod e_+ = 0$  as no anticlique can include that hyperedge. Since all hyperedges have at most  $n$  vertices,  $|e| \leq n$ , which is what we wanted.  $\square$

We also reverse this construction. Given a boolean algebra  $A$  with an  $\omega$ -independent generating set  $H$ , we construct a hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ ; we call it the  $\perp$ -hypergraph of  $A, H$ . The vertex set is  $H$ , and the hyperedge set is defined as follows; a subset  $e$  of  $H$  is a hyperedge if and only if the following three conditions are all true:

- (1)  $e$  is finite.
- (2)  $\prod e = 0$ .
- (3) If  $f \subsetneq e$ , then  $\prod f \neq 0$ .

We have only finite hyperedges in this graph, and no hyperedge is contained in another. Note that if  $H$  is  $n$ -independent, the hyperedge set is included in  $[H]^{\leq n}$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer or  $\omega$ ,  $X \subseteq A$  be  $n$ -independent and generate  $A$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = \langle X, E \rangle$  be the  $\perp$ -hypergraph of  $A$ . Then  $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f : X \rightarrow X_+$  be defined so that  $v \mapsto v_+$  for  $v \in X$ . We claim that  $f$  is an  $n$ -preserving function. If  $G \subseteq X$  is of size  $\leq n$  such that  $\prod G = 0$ , then it has a subset  $G'$  minimal for the property of having 0 product; thus  $G' \in E$ , so that  $\prod G'_+ = 0$ , and so  $\prod f[G] = 0$ .

$f$  is bijective, and its inverse is also  $n$ -preserving; the image of  $f$  is a generating set, so that  $f$  extends to an isomorphism.  $\square$

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{G}_i \langle V_i, E_i \rangle$  be hypergraphs for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . A hypergraph homomorphism is a function  $f : V_0 \rightarrow V_1$  such that if  $e \in E_0$ , then  $f[e] \in E_1$ .

Notice that a graph homomorphism is a hypergraph homomorphism when the graphs are considered as 2-uniform hypergraphs.

In the rest of this section we consider ordinary graphs, that is, hypergraphs for which  $E \subseteq V^2$ . In this case, “clique” is not ambiguous, so we can define the clique algebra of a graph. We let  $C(\mathcal{G})$  be the set of cliques in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $v_+$  be the set of cliques including vertex  $v$ . (This conflicts with an earlier use of  $v_+$ , but context will make it clear which is meant.) Then  $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$  is the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(C(\mathcal{G}))$  generated by  $\{v_+ : v \in G\}$ .

We give some examples of 2-free boolean algebras with unusual properties.

For a 2-free algebra of the form  $\mathcal{B}_c(T)$  for a tree (in the graph-theoretical sense—a connected acyclic graph) or a forest  $T$  of size  $\kappa$ , there are further conclusions that can be drawn. As a forest has no triangles, all the cliques in  $T$  are of size at most 2.

So any subset of  $T_+$  of size 3 or more has a disjoint pair.

If  $T$  is a  $\kappa$ -tree (in the order theoretic sense, that is, of height  $\kappa$  and each level of size  $< \kappa$ ), and we take the edge set to consist of pairs  $\{u, v\}$  where  $v$  is an immediate successor of  $u$ , then  $T_+$  has a pairwise disjoint subset of size  $\kappa$ —take an element of every other level—so that  $\text{FinCo}(\kappa) \leq \mathcal{B}_c(T)$ , and  $\text{Fr}(\kappa) \leq \mathcal{B}_a(T)$ .

It seems difficult to avoid one of  $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$  and  $\text{Fr}(\kappa)$  as a subalgebra, as it is necessary to find a graph of size  $\kappa$  with no clique or anticlique of size  $\kappa$ . A witness to  $\kappa \not\rightarrow (\kappa)_2^2$  is the edge set of such a graph, but we do not know about the variety of such witnesses. If  $\kappa$  is weakly compact, then there are no such witnesses and so for any graph of size  $\kappa$ ,  $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$  or  $\text{Fr}(\kappa)$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$ .

As a graph can be characterized as a symmetric non-reflexive relation, for any non-reflexive relation  $R$ , we may form algebras  $\mathcal{B}_a(R \cup R^{-1})$  and  $\mathcal{B}_c(R \cup R^{-1})$ . When  $R$  is an ordering of some sort,  $R \cup R^{-1}$  is usually called the (edge set of the) comparability graph of  $R$ . Thus for a (non-reflexive) ordering  $\langle P, < \rangle$ , it has comparability graph  $\mathcal{G}_P = \langle P, < \cup <^{-1} \rangle$  and we define its comparability algebra  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G}_P)$  and its incomparability algebra  $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}_P)$ . Since points in the partial order are vertices of the comparability graph, we may use the  $p_+$  notation without fear of confusion. When  $P$  is a partial order in the strict sense,  $C \subseteq P$  is a clique in  $\mathcal{G}_P$  if and only if  $C$  is a chain in  $\leq$  if and only if  $C_+$  is an independent subset of  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$ , and  $A \subseteq P$  is an anticlique in  $\mathcal{G}_P$  if and only if  $A$  is an antichain in  $\leq$  if and only if  $A_+$  is a pairwise disjoint set in  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$ . So if  $\langle T, \leq \rangle$  is a  $\kappa$ -Suslin tree, in both  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(T)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(T)$ ,  $T_+$  is a 2-independent set of size  $\kappa$ , but has no independent subset of size  $\kappa$ , nor a pairwise disjoint subset of size  $\kappa$  since  $T$  has neither chains nor antichains of size  $\kappa$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *If  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  is a strictly order-preserving function, that is, a morphism in the category of partial orders, then there is a homomorphism  $f^* : \mathcal{B}_{aco}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{aco}(Q)$  such that  $f^*(p_+) = f(p)_+$ .*

*Proof.* By the universal property of 2-free boolean algebras, we need only show that  $g$  is 2-preserving where  $g(p_+) = f(p)_+$ ; then  $g$  extends to the  $f^*$  of the conclusion.

Fix distinct  $p, p' \in P$ ; if  $p_+ \perp p'_+$  in  $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(P)$ , then  $p$  and  $p'$  are comparable in  $P$ , without loss of generality,  $p < p'$ . Then  $f(p) < f(p')$ , so that  $f(p)_+ \perp f(p')_+$ .  $\square$

Similarly, an incomparability-preserving map from  $P$  to  $Q$  gives rise to a homomorphism of  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{co}(Q)$ .

### 3. HYPERGRAPH SPACES

The dual spaces to  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras are also interesting. Like with graphs, a hypergraph space may be defined in terms of a hypergraph—the definition generalizes that of a graph space.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle G, E \rangle$  be a hypergraph and  $A(\mathcal{G})$  its set of anticliques. For each  $v \in G$ , we define two sets:

$$v_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \in A\}$$

$$v_- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \notin A\}.$$

Then the hypergraph space of  $\mathcal{G}$  is the topology on  $A(\mathcal{G})$  with  $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$  as a closed subbase.

Any topological space  $\mathcal{T}$  for which there is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $\mathcal{T}$  is homeomorphic to the hypergraph space of  $\mathcal{G}$  is called a hypergraph space.

**Theorem 3.2.** *The Stone dual of an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra is a hypergraph space.*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra. Thus by theorem 2.3, there is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the hypergraph space of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We claim that  $\text{Clop}(\mathcal{T}) \cong A$ .

In fact,  $\text{Clop}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ . On both sides here, elements are sets of anticliques of  $\mathcal{G}$ . As  $\mathcal{T}$  is defined by a clopen subbase, elements of  $\text{Clop}(\mathcal{T})$  are finite unions of finite intersections of elements of that subbase  $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$ . Elements of the right hand side are sums of elementary products of elements of  $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v\}_+$ , that is, sums of finite products of elements of  $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$ . As the operations are the usual set-theoretic ones on both sides, they are in fact the same algebra.

The topological result follows by duality.  $\square$

We repeat a few definitions from Bell and van Mill [3] needed for some topological applications.

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $n \in \omega$  for all these definitions.

A set  $S$  is  $n$ -linked if every  $X \in [S]^n$  has non-empty intersection.

A set  $P$  is  $n$ -ary if every  $n$ -linked subset of  $P$  has non-empty intersection.

A compact topological space  $\mathcal{T}$  has compactness number at most  $n$ , written  $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ , if and only if it has an  $n$ -ary closed subbase.  $\mathcal{T}$  has compactness number  $n$ , written  $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) = n$ , if and only if  $n$  is the least integer for which  $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ .  $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) = \omega$  if there is no such  $n$ .

The following generalizes and algebraizes proposition 3.1 of Bell [1].

**Proposition 3.4.** *If a boolean algebra  $A$  is  $n$ -free for some  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ , then  $\text{cmprn}(\text{Ult } A) \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* This is vacuous if  $n = \omega$ . If  $n < \omega$ , then  $\text{Ult}(A)$  is a hypergraph space for a hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  with all hyperedges of size  $\leq n$ .

We take the clopen subbase  $S = \bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$  of the hypergraph space of  $\mathcal{G}$  and show that it is  $n$ -ary. Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq S$  be  $n$ -linked. We may write  $\mathcal{F} = \{v_+ : v \in A\} \cup \{v_- : v \in B\}$  for some  $A, B \subseteq G$ . Since  $v_+ \cap v_- = \emptyset$  and  $n \geq 2$ ,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . Let  $A'$  be a finite subset of  $A$ . Since any product of  $n$  or fewer elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  is non-zero,  $A'$  must be an anticlique in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; if not, then  $\prod A'_+ = 0$ , so then  $A'_+$  would have a subset of size  $n$  with empty intersection, contradicting that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $n$ -linked. Thus  $A' \in \bigcap \mathcal{F}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{F}$  has non-empty intersection and thus  $S$  is  $n$ -ary.  $\square$

Bell's [2] corollary 5.2 shows that certain topologies on  $[\omega_1]^{\leq m}$  have compactness number  $n$  for certain  $n, m \leq \omega$ . These topologies are the hypergraph spaces of  $\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-3} \rangle$  and  $\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-2} \rangle$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *For infinitely many  $n \in \omega$ , there is a boolean algebra which is  $n$ -free and is not  $(n-1)$ -free.*

*Proof.* Let  $k$  be the least integer for which  $\mathcal{B}_a(\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-3} \rangle)$  is  $k$ -free and  $\ell$  be the least integer for which  $\mathcal{B}_a(\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-2} \rangle)$  is  $\ell$ -free. We have that  $n \leq k \leq 2n-3$  and  $n \leq \ell \leq 2n-2$ . The lower bounds are a consequence of the compactness numbers of those spaces (Bell's [2] result and proposition 3.4), while the upper bounds are a consequence of theorem 2.2.

Thus we have, for arbitrary  $n \in \omega$ , an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra of finite freeness at least  $n$ .  $\square$

#### 4. CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we consider the categories of  $n$ -independently generated boolean algebras and of hypergraph spaces and their behavior under some constructions.

If a boolean algebra  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free, it is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$  for some hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$ ; we'll call this the  $\perp$ -hypergraph of  $A$ . If a boolean algebra is 2-free, this  $\perp$ -hypergraph is a graph, so we can just call it the  $\perp$ -graph. Such a boolean algebra is also isomorphic to  $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$  for a graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , which is called the intersection graph of  $A$ .

We will show in section 5 that complete boolean algebras are not  $\omega$ -free. As  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$  is isomorphic to  ${}^\kappa 2$ , the class of  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras is not closed under infinite products.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ . If  $H \subseteq A$  and  $K \subseteq B$  are  $n$ -independent, then  $L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (H \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times K)$  is  $n$ -independent in  $A \times B$ .*

*Proof.* We will apply proposition 1.7. Suppose that  $F \in [H]^{<\omega}$ ,  $G \in [K]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^F 2$ ,  $\delta \in {}^G 2$ , and  $\prod_{x \in F} (x, 0)^{\varepsilon_x} \cdot \prod_{y \in G} (0, y)^{\delta_y} = 0$ . If there are  $x \in F$  and  $y \in G$  such that  $\varepsilon_x = \delta_y = 1$ , then  $(x, 0) \cdot (0, y) = 0$  as desired. Otherwise, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\varepsilon[F] \subseteq \{0\}$ . Then  $\prod_{x \in F} (x, 0)^{\varepsilon_x} = (\prod_{x \in F} -x, 1)$ , so that  $\prod_{y \in Y} y^{\delta_y} = 0$ ; then the  $n$ -independence of  $K$  gives the result.  $\square$

It is important to note that  $L$  does not generate  $\langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$ ; in fact (theorem 4.4), the product of  $n$ -free boolean algebras is not in general  $n$ -free. However, it is the case that  $\langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$  is a simple extension of the subalgebra generated by  $L$ ;  $\langle L \rangle((1, 0)) = \langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$ .

This result generalizes to infinite products quite easily, though the notation is considerably more cumbersome.

**Theorem 4.2.** *For  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ , if  $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle$  is a system of boolean algebras and for every  $i \in I$ ,  $H_i \subseteq A_i$  is  $n$ -independent in  $A_i$ , then the set  $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in I} p_i[H_i]$ , where*

$$p_i(h)(j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} h & i = j \\ 0 & i \neq j \end{cases}$$

*is  $n$ -independent in  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i \in I} A_i$  and  $\prod_{i \in I}^w A_i$ .*

*Proof.* This is essentially the same as theorem 4.1 with more cumbersome notation.

$p_i(h)$  is the function in  $A$  that is 0 in all but the  $i$ th coordinate and is  $h$  in the  $i$ th coordinate, so that the projections  $\pi_i[p_i[H_i]] = H_i$  and for  $i \neq j$ ,  $\pi_j[p_i[H_i]] = \{0\}$ .

We apply proposition 1.7. Suppose that  $R \in [H]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ , and  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ . Let  $J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in I : R \cap p_i[H_i] \neq \emptyset\}$ . If  $J$  is a singleton, say  $J = \{i\}$ , then the  $n$ -independence of  $H_i$  clearly makes  $H$   $n$ -independent. So we now concern ourselves with the case that  $|J| > 1$ , that is, we have distinct  $i, j \in J$ . If there are  $x \in p_i[H_i]$  and  $y \in p_j[H_j]$  with  $\varepsilon_x = \varepsilon_y = 1$ , then  $x \cdot y = 0$  and we have our conclusion. So we may assume that there is at most one  $i \in J$  for which there is an  $x \in p_i[H_i]$  such that  $\varepsilon_x = 1$ . Then for any particular  $i \in I$ ,  $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R, x \notin p_i[H_i]\}$  has  $i$ -th coordinate 1, and so the facts that

$$0 = \prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \cap p_i[H_i]\},$$

and that all the  $H_i$  are  $n$ -independent make  $H$   $n$ -independent.  $\square$

When  $n = 2$ , we can also consider the  $\perp$ -graph and intersection graph of  $H$  in the above theorem. The intersection graph is easily described: two elements of  $H$  have non-zero product if and only if they have non-zero product in one of the factors, so that the intersection graph is the disjoint union of the intersection graphs of the  $H_i$ . The  $\perp$ -graph is more complex. The  $\perp$ -graph of each  $H_i$  is an induced subgraph, but these subgraphs are connected to each other—each vertex in  $H_i$  is connected to every vertex in  $H_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . This construction is the “join”.

In other words, for any collection  $\langle \mathcal{G}_i \rangle$  of graphs,  $\mathcal{B}_c(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G}_i)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_a(\biguplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}_i)$ .

The use of the word “free” in  $n$ -free is warranted by the following:

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose that  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{i \in I}^C A_i$  is an amalgamated free product of subalgebras  $A_i$  for  $i \in I$ , where  $C \leq A_i$  for each  $i \in I$ ,  $A_i \cap A_j = C$  for  $i \neq j$ ,  $A_i$  is  $n$ -free over  $H_i$ , and  $C \leq \langle H_i \cap H_j \rangle$ . Then  $A$  is  $n$ -free over  $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$ .*

*Proof.* For convenience, assume that each  $A_i \leq A$ ,  $C \leq A_i$  and that, for  $i \neq j$ ,  $A_i \cap A_j = C$ , and that  $H_i$  is a set over which  $A_i$  is  $n$ -free. We show that  $A$  is  $n$ -free over  $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$ .

Let  $B$  be a boolean algebra, and  $f : H \rightarrow B$  be  $n$ -preserving. Then for each  $i \in I$ ,  $f_i := f \upharpoonright H_i$  is also  $n$ -preserving. So each  $f_i$  extends to a unique homomorphism  $\varphi_i : A_i \rightarrow B$ . That  $\varphi_i \upharpoonright C = \varphi_j \upharpoonright C$  is clear as  $C \subseteq \langle H_i \cap H_j \rangle$ .

Then the universal property of amalgamated free products gives a unique homomorphism  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  that extends every  $\varphi_i$ . Note that

$$\varphi \upharpoonright H = \varphi \upharpoonright \bigcup_{i \in I} H_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (\varphi \upharpoonright H_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (\varphi_i \upharpoonright H_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} f_i = f.$$

So we have a unique extension of  $f$  to a homomorphism, which is what we wanted.  $\square$

This of course includes free products.

An example where  $C \neq \{0, 1\}$  is as follows: Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the complete graph on the ordinal  $\omega_1 + \omega$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  the complete graph on the ordinal interval  $(\omega_1, \omega_1 \cdot 2)$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{H}) \cong \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ . Note that  $G \cap H = (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)$  so that  $G_+ \cap H_+ = (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)_+$ ; we let  $C = \langle (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)_+ \rangle \cong \text{Fr}(\omega)$ . It is clear that  $C$  is as required in theorem 4.3. Then we have that  $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \oplus_C \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{H})$  is 2-free over  $G_+ \cup H_+$ .

If  $C$  is 2-free over  $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$ , the  $\perp$ -graph of  $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$  is easily described in terms of those of  $H_i$ . It is the “amalgamated free product” or “amalgamated disjoint union” in the category of graphs—the same universal property holds. More concretely, given a set of graphs  $\mathcal{G}_i = \langle G_i, E_i \rangle$ , each of which has  $\mathcal{F} = \langle F, E \rangle$  as a subgraph, the amalgamated disjoint union of the  $\mathcal{G}_i$  over  $\mathcal{F}$  is a graph on the union of the vertex sets where two vertices are adjacent if and only if they are adjacent in some  $\mathcal{G}_i$ . That is, elements of  $G_i \setminus F$  and  $G_j \setminus F$  are not adjacent for  $i \neq j$ .

In case  $C = 2$  and we have a free product, the  $A_i$  form a family of independent subalgebras, so two elements of  $H$  (constructed in the proof above) have product zero if and only if they are in the same  $H_i$  and have zero product in  $A_i$ . So the  $\perp$ -graph of  $H$  is the disjoint union of the  $\perp$  graphs of the  $H_i$ . The intersection graph of  $H$  is similarly constructed from those of the  $H_i$ : the independence of the  $A_i$  means that the intersection graph of  $H$  is the join of the intersection graphs of the  $H_i$ .

That is,  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{B}_a(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i)$  and  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{B}_c(\biguplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i)$ .

Products of  $n$ -free boolean algebras behave in a somewhat more complicated manner. As discussed previously, infinite products of  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras are not necessarily  $\omega$ -free.

**Theorem 4.4.**  $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  is not 2-free.

*Proof.* We use subscript function notation for the coordinates of tuples; i.e.  $(a, b)_0 = a$  and  $(a, b)_1 = b$ . We also extend this to sets of tuples;  $\{(a, b), (c, d)\}_0 = \{a, c\}$ .

We proceed by contradiction; suppose that  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  is 2-free over  $X$ , where  $0 \notin X$ , that is,  $X$  is 2-independent.

Consider  $a_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\{\alpha\}, 0)$  for  $\alpha < \omega_1$ .  $a_\alpha$  is an atom in  $A$ , so it must be an elementary product of  $X$ , that is,  $a_\alpha = \prod_{x \in H_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)}$ , with  $H_\alpha \in [X]^{<\omega}$ . So let  $M \in [\omega_1]^{\omega_1}$  be such that  $\{H_\alpha : \alpha \in M\}$  is a  $\Delta$ -system with root  $F$ . Let  $G_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_\alpha \setminus F$ . Since

$$M = \bigcup_{\delta \in {}^F 2} \{\alpha \in M : \forall x \in F [\varepsilon(\alpha, x) = \delta_x]\},$$

there is an uncountable  $N \subseteq M$  such that  $\varepsilon(\alpha, x) = \varepsilon(\beta, x)$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in N$  and all  $x \in F$ , so that we may write, for  $\alpha \in N$ ,  $a_\alpha = \prod_{x \in F} x^{\delta_x} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)}$ . For each  $\alpha \in N$ , let  $G'_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in G_\alpha : \varepsilon(\alpha, x) = 1\}$ . If  $\alpha, \beta \in N$  with  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , then there are  $x \in G'_\alpha$  and  $y \in G'_\beta$  such that  $x \cdot y = 0$ , by the 2-independence of  $X$  and the fact that

$$0 = a_\alpha \cdot a_\beta = \prod_{x \in F} x^{\delta_x} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\beta} x^{\varepsilon(\beta, x)},$$

thus  $\prod G'_\alpha \cdot \prod G'_\beta = 0$ . Since  $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  has cellularity  $\omega$ , the set  $\{\alpha \in N : (\prod G'_\alpha)_1 \neq 0\}$  is countable, hence  $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N \setminus \{\alpha \in N : (\prod G'_\alpha)_1 \neq 0\}$  is uncountable and for  $\alpha \in P$ ,  $(\prod G'_\alpha)_1 = 0$ . Since  $(\prod G'_\alpha)_0 \cdot (\prod G'_\beta)_0 = 0$  for distinct  $\alpha, \beta \in P$ , each  $(\prod G'_\alpha)_0$  is finite when  $\alpha \in P$ .

$X$  must generate  $(1, 0)$ ; let  $b_j$  for  $j < n$  be disjoint elementary products of  $X$  such that  $\sum_{j < n} b_j = (1, 0)$ . Thus there must be exactly one  $i < n$  such that  $b_{i0}$  is cofinite; without loss of generality,  $i = 0$  so that  $b_{00}$  is cofinite and  $b_{01} = 0$ . Write  $b_0$  as an elementary product, that is  $b_0 = \prod_{j < m} c_j^{\xi_j}$  with each  $c_j \in X$ . Then choose an  $\alpha \in P$  such that  $\prod G'_\alpha \leq b_0$  and  $G'_\alpha \cap \{c_j : j < m\} = \emptyset$ . Then  $\prod G'_\alpha \cdot \sum_{j < n} c_j^{1-\xi_j} = 0$ , so  $\text{rng } \xi = \{0\}$ ; that is,  $b_0 = \prod_{j < m} -c_j$ .

Note that  $X_1$  generates  $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ , so it must be uncountable, thus  $(X \setminus \{c_j : j < m\} \setminus F)_1$  is also uncountable; let  $Y \subseteq X$  be such that  $Y_1$  is an uncountable independent subset of  $(X \setminus \{c_j : j < m\} \setminus F)_1$ ; such a  $Y$  exists by theorem 9.16 of Koppelberg [6]. Note that no finite product of elements of  $Y$  is 0. Let  $\theta : Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be such that  $d_y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (y^{\theta_y})_0$  is finite for each  $y \in Y$ .

Consider  $\{d_y : y \in Y\}$ ; Each  $d_y$  is finite and  $Y$  is an uncountable set, and thus there is an uncountable  $Z \subseteq Y$  where  $\{d_y : y \in Z\}$  is a  $\Delta$ -system with root  $r$ . Let  $y, z, t \in Z$  be distinct. Then let  $e_y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_y \setminus r$ ,  $e_z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_z \setminus r$ , and  $e_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_t \setminus r$ . Then

$$d_y \cdot d_z \cdot \dots \cdot d_t = (e_y \cup r) \cap (e_z \cup r) \cap (\dots \cap (e_t \cup r)) = r \cap (\omega_1 \setminus (e_t \cup r)) = \emptyset,$$

Then  $\prod_{j < n} -c_j \cdot y^{\theta_y} \cdot z^{\theta_z} \cdot \dots \cdot t^{1-\theta_t} = 0$  and again, the only elements with exponent 1 are elements of  $Y$  and thus there is no disjoint pair, contradicting proposition 1.7.

So we have a contradiction and thus there is no 2-independent generating set for  $A$ .  $\square$

This is also an example of a simple extension of a 2-free boolean algebra that is not 2-free; the full product is a simple extension by  $(0, 1)$  of the subalgebra generated by the set in theorem 4.1.

The dual of this theorem is that we have two graph spaces whose disjoint union is not a graph space; in fact we can say a bit more since the disjoint union of two supercompact spaces is supercompact. We show a slightly more general result here:

**Proposition 4.5.** *If  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $n$ -compact spaces, then  $X \dot{\cup} Y$  is  $n$ -compact.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $S$  and  $T$  are  $n$ -ary subbases for the closed sets of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively; that is, for any  $S' \subseteq S$  with  $\bigcap S' = \emptyset$ , there are  $n$  members  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  of  $S'$  such that  $a_1 \cap a_2 \cap \dots \cap a_n = \emptyset$ , and similarly for  $T$ . Then  $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S \cup T \cup \{X, Y\}$  is an  $n$ -ary subbase for the closed sets of  $X \dot{\cup} Y$ .  $\square$

So, letting  $n = 2$ , the dual space of  $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  is supercompact, but is not a graph space.

**Theorem 4.6.**  $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  is 3-free.

*Proof.* Let  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  be an independent generating set for  $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ . Then the set  $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\{\alpha\}, x_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\} \cup \{(1, 0)\}$  is a 3-independent generating set for  $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ . That  $X$  generates  $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$  is clear. We use proposition 1.7 to show that  $X$  is 3-independent. Take any  $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = (0, 0)$ . Since there is no elementary product of elements of  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  that is 0,  $(1, 0) \in R$  and  $\varepsilon_{(1,0)} = 1$ . Then there is a pair  $a, b$  of elements in  $R$  such that  $\pi_2(a) \perp \pi_2 b$  and  $\varepsilon_a = \varepsilon_b = 1$ , so that  $\{(1, 0), a, b\} \subseteq R$  and  $(1, 0) \cdot a \cdot b = 0$ .  $\square$

## 5. CARDINAL FUNCTION RESULTS

Cellularity and independence have been considered earlier. Here we give a few results relating other cardinal functions to properties of  $\perp$ -graphs and intersection graphs. We will always assume that the graphs and algebras are infinite in this section.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $A$  be  $\omega$ -free and  $\omega \leq \kappa = |A|$ . Then  $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{FinCo}(\kappa)$  is a homomorphic image of  $A$ .

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a set over which  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free. Any bijective function  $f : G \rightarrow \text{At}(B)$  is  $\omega$ -preserving as all elements of  $\text{At}(B)$  are disjoint. Since  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free,  $f$  extends to a homomorphism  $\tilde{f}$  from  $A$  to  $B$ . Since the image of  $f$  includes a set of generators,  $\tilde{f}$  is surjective as well; that is,  $B$  is a homomorphic image of  $A$ .  $\square$

The first use of this is that no infinite  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra has the countable separation property. The countable separation property is inherited by homomorphic images (5.27(c) in Koppelberg [6]), so if any infinite  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra of size  $\kappa$  has the countable separation property, then by 5.1,  $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$  has the countable separation property, which is a contradiction. In particular,  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$  is not  $\omega$ -free.

We show that the spread of an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra is equal to its cardinality.

Theorem 13.1 of Monk [8] gives several equivalent definitions of spread, all of which have the same attainment properties; the relevant one to our purposes is the following.

$$s(A) = \sup \{c(B) : B \text{ is a homomorphic image of } A\}.$$

**Theorem 5.2.** For  $A$   $\omega$ -free,  $s(A) = |A|$ . Furthermore, it is attained.

*Proof.* From lemma 5.1,  $B = \text{FinCo}(|A|)$  is a homomorphic image of  $A$ . Since  $c(B) = |B| = |A|$ , an element of the set in the above definition of  $s(A)$  is  $|A|$ . Thus  $s(A) = |A|$  is attained.  $\square$

As they are greater than or equal to  $s$ ,  $\text{Inc}$ ,  $\text{Irr}$ ,  $\text{h-cof}$ ,  $\text{hL}$ , and  $\text{hd}$  are also equal to cardinality for  $\omega$ -free boolean algebras. Incomparability and irredundance are also attained by the  $\omega$ -free generating set. This result also determines that  $|\text{Id}A| = 2^{|A|}$  as  $2^{sA} \leq |\text{Id}A|$ . Then since  $s$  is attained,  $|\text{Sub}A| = 2^{|A|}$  as well.

The character of an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra is also equal to cardinality. Namely, at the bottom of page 183 in Monk [8], it is shown that if  $A$  is a homomorphic image of  $B$ , then  $\chi(A) \leq \chi(B)$ . For  $B$   $\omega$ -free, let  $A = \text{FinCo}(|B|)$ , so that  $A$  is a homomorphic image of  $B$  by lemma 5.1, so we have that  $|B| = \chi(A) \leq \chi(B) \leq |B|$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *If  $A$  is infinite and  $\omega$ -free, then  $\pi(A) = |A|$ .*

Here  $\pi$  is the density of  $A$ , the minimum of the cardinalities of dense subsets of  $A$ .

*Proof.* Take  $H$  to be a set over which  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free and let  $D \subseteq A^+$  be dense.

For each  $d \in D$ , we can find a non-zero elementary product of elements of  $H$  below  $d$ ; write it as  $\prod F_d \cdot \prod -G_d$  for finite disjoint  $F_d, G_d \subseteq H$ .

Now we show that  $H = \bigcup_{d \in D} F_d$ . Obviously  $\bigcup_{d \in D} F_d \subseteq H$ , so we need only show  $H \subseteq \bigcup_{d \in D} F_d$ . Choose an  $h \in H$ . Since  $D$  is dense, there is a  $d \in D$  with  $d \leq h$ . So  $\prod F_d \cdot \prod -G_d \leq d \leq h$ . Thus  $\prod F_d \leq h + \sum G_d$ , and since  $H$  is  $\omega$ -independent,  $h \in F_d$ .

Since all the  $F_d$  are finite,  $|D| = |H| = |A|$   $\square$

We claim that the length (and therefore depth) of an  $\omega$ -free boolean algebra is  $\aleph_0$ . This uses several preceding results.

**Theorem 5.4.** *If  $A$  is  $\omega$ -free, then  $A$  has no uncountable chain.*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be  $\omega$ -free over  $G$ .

Recall from theorem 1.14 that  $A$  is a semigroup algebra over the set  $H$  of finite products of elements of  $G \cup \{0, 1\}$ . For  $h \in H \setminus \{0, 1\}$ , choose  $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$  such that  $h = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n$  and set  $h_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ .

Due to the result of Heindorf [4], if there is an uncountable chain in  $A$ , there is an uncountable chain in  $H$ . So by way of contradiction, we assume that there is an uncountable chain  $C \subseteq H$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $0, 1 \notin C$  so that every element of  $C$  is a finite product of elements of  $G$ .

Let  $C_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h_G : h \in C\}$ . We note that

$$\bigcup C_G = \bigcup_{h \in C} h_G \subseteq G$$

is the set of all elements of  $G$  that are needed to generate the elements of  $C$ , that is,

$C \subseteq \langle \bigcup C_G \rangle$ . so  $C$  is a chain in that subalgebra of  $A$  as well.

In order to reach a contradiction, we first show that there are no finite subsets of  $\bigcup C_G$  with zero product. Take  $F \in [\bigcup C_G]^{<\omega}$ . Then for each  $v \in F$ , there is a  $c_v \in C_G$  such that  $v \in c_v$ . Note that  $\prod c_v \in C$  and  $\prod c_v \leq v$ . Thus  $\{\prod c_v : v \in F\} \subseteq C$ , so  $0 \neq \prod \{\prod c_v : v \in F\} \leq \prod F$ , and hence  $\prod F \neq 0$ .

Thus  $\bigcup C_G$  has no finite subset with zero product. As  $\bigcup C_G \subseteq G$  is  $\omega$ -independent, by lemma 1.8, it is independent. Thus  $\langle \bigcup C_G \rangle$  is free and hence has no uncountable chain, contradicting our original assumption.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $A$  be  $\omega$ -free over  $H$ . Then  $|\text{End } A| = 2^{|A|}$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $x \in H$ , choose  $y_x \in A$  such that  $y_x < x$ . For each  $J \subset H$ , define  $f_J : H \rightarrow A$  as

$$f_J(x) = \begin{cases} y_x & x \in J \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$f_J$  is 2-preserving and extends to an endomorphism. So we have exhibited  $2^{|A|}$  endomorphisms.  $\square$

6. MAXIMAL  $n$ -INDEPENDENCE NUMBER

We can look at  $n$ -independent sets in boolean algebras that aren't  $n$ -free. The natural thing to do is introduce a cardinal function,  $n\text{Ind}$ , that measures the supremum of the cardinalities of those sets. Since  $n\text{Ind}$  is a regular sup-function, we can define a spectrum function and a maximal  $n$ -independence number of a boolean algebra in the standard way.

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ .

$$\mathfrak{i}_{nsp}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{|X| : X \text{ is a maximal } n\text{-independent subset of } A\}$$

$$\mathfrak{i}_n(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(\mathfrak{i}_{nsp}(A))$$

This could be written as  $n\text{Ind}_{mm}$  according to the notation of Monk [8]. Note that  $\mathfrak{i}_1 = \mathfrak{i}$  where  $\mathfrak{i}$  is the minimal independence number as seen in Monk [9].

This is defined for every boolean algebra; from the definition it is easily seen that the union of a chain of  $n$ -independent sets is  $n$ -independent, so Zorn's lemma shows that there are maximal  $n$ -independent sets.  $\mathfrak{i}_n(A)$  is infinite for all  $n \leq \omega$  if  $A$  is atomless (shown in lemma 6.3), and has value 1 if  $A$  has an atom.

**Proposition 6.2.** For all  $n$  with  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ , if  $A$  has an atom, then  $\mathfrak{i}_n(A) = 1$ .

*Proof.* If  $a$  is an atom of  $A$ , then we claim that  $\{-a\}$  is a maximal  $n$ -independent subset of  $A^+$ . That  $\{-a\}$  is  $n$ -independent is clear as any singleton other than  $\{0\}$  and  $\{1\}$  is independent.

Let  $x \in A^+ \setminus \{-a\}$ , we show that  $\{-a, x\}$  is not  $n$ -independent. There are two cases.

If  $a \leq x$ , then  $1 = a + -a \leq x + -a$ , so that  $(\perp 1)$  fails.

If  $a \leq -x$ , then  $x \leq -a$ , so that  $0 \neq \prod \{x\} \leq \sum \{-a\}$ , but  $\{x\} \cap \{-a\} = \emptyset$ , so that  $(\perp 3)$  fails.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.** Let  $B$  be a boolean algebra,  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ , and  $H \subseteq B^+$  be  $n$ -independent. If  $H$  is maximal among  $n$ -independent subsets of  $B^+$ , then  $H$  is infinite and  $\sum H = 1$  or  $H$  is finite and  $-\sum H$  is an atom.

*Proof.* We prove the contrapositive. First, the case that  $H$  is infinite. Let  $H \subseteq B^+$  be  $n$ -independent and have  $b < 1$  as an upper bound. We show that  $H \cup \{-b\}$  is  $n$ -independent:

Note that  $-b \notin H$ , as  $-b \not\leq b$ . Now we will apply proposition 1.7. So, assume that  $R \in [H \cup \{-b\}]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ , and  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ . If  $-b \notin R$ , the conclusion follows since  $H$  is  $n$ -independent. So suppose that  $-b \in R$ . Let  $R' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \setminus \{-b\}$ . Then we have two cases:

Case 1.  $\varepsilon_{-b} = 1$ . If there is an  $x \in R'$  such that  $\varepsilon_x = 1$ , then  $x \leq b$  and so  $x \cdot -b = 0$  as desired. So assume that  $\varepsilon[R'] = \{0\}$ . Then  $-b \leq \sum_{x \in R'} x \leq b$ , which is a contradiction.

Case 2.  $\varepsilon_{-b} = 0$ . If  $\varepsilon_x = 1$  for some  $x \in R'$ , then

$$0 = \prod_{y \in R} y^{\varepsilon_y} = \prod_{y \in R'} y^{\varepsilon_y} \cdot b = \prod_{y \in R'} y^{\varepsilon_y}$$

and the  $n$ -independence of  $H$  gives the result. So assume that  $\varepsilon[R'] = \{0\}$ . Then  $b \leq \sum R' \leq b$ , so  $b = \sum R'$ . Then  $b \cdot \prod_{x \in R'} -x = 0$ , contradicting the  $n$ -independence of  $H$ .

So we have that if  $H$  is infinite and maximal  $n$ -independent, it has no upper bound other than 1, so  $\sum H = 1$ .

Now we consider the case that  $H$  is finite. If  $-\sum H$  is not an atom, let  $0 < a < -\sum H$ , then we claim that  $H \cup \{a\}$  is  $n$ -independent. Again we use proposition 1.7. Assume that  $R \in [H \cup \{a\}]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ , and  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ . Without loss of generality,  $a \in R$ .

Case 1.  $\varepsilon_a = 1$ . If  $\varepsilon_x = 1$  for some  $x \in R \setminus \{a\}$ , then  $a \cdot x \leq a \cdot \sum H = 0$ , as desired. Otherwise

$$a \leq \sum (R \setminus \{a\}) \leq \sum H$$

and so  $a = 0$ , contradiction.

Case 2.  $\varepsilon_a = 0$ . If  $\varepsilon_x = 1$  for some  $x \in R \setminus \{a\}$ , then  $a \cdot x = 0$ , hence  $x \leq -a$ , and then

$$\prod_{y \in R} y^{\varepsilon_y} = \prod \{y^{\varepsilon_y} : y \in R \setminus \{a\}\}$$

and the conclusion follows. Otherwise

$$-a \leq \sum (R \setminus \{a\}) \leq \sum H,$$

so  $-\sum H \leq a$ , contradicting  $a < -\sum H$ . □

The converse of lemma 6.3 does not hold. An example due to Monk is in  $\text{Fr}(X \cup Y)$  where  $X \cap Y = \emptyset$  and  $|X| = |Y| = \kappa \geq \omega$ .  $X$  is independent, is not maximal for 2-independence, and has sum 1. Here  $\sum X = 1$  is the only non-trivial part—by way of contradiction, let  $b$  be a non-1 upper bound for  $X$ . Then  $-b$  has the property that  $x \cdot -b = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , so let  $a$  be an elementary product of elements of  $X \cup Y$  where  $a \leq -b$ . Take some  $x \in X$  that does not occur in that elementary product. Then since  $X \cup Y$  is independent,  $a \cdot x \neq 0$ , but since  $a \leq -b$ ,  $a \cdot x = 0$ .

**Theorem 6.4.** *For  $B$  atomless, and  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}(B) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(B)$ .*

Here  $\mathfrak{p}(B)$  is the pseudo-intersection number, defined in Monk [9] as

$$\mathfrak{p}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \left\{ |Y| : Y \subseteq A \text{ and } \sum Y = 1 \text{ and } \sum Y' \neq 1 \text{ for every finite } Y' \subseteq Y \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $B$  is atomless, a maximal  $n$ -independent set  $Y$  has  $\sum Y = 1$ , and by  $(\perp 1)$ , if  $Y' \subseteq Y$  is finite,  $\sum Y' \neq 1$ . That is, the maximal  $n$ -independent sets are included among the  $Y$  in the definition of  $\mathfrak{p}$ . □

We do not know if strict inequality is possible.

**Corollary 6.5.** *For all  $n$  with  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ ,  $\mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) \geq \aleph_1$*

*Proof.*  $\aleph_1 \leq \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin})$  □

We also recall that under Martin's Axiom,  $\mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \mathfrak{z}_1$ , so the same is true of  $\mathfrak{i}_n$ .

**Proposition 6.6.** *Any  $B$  with the strong countable separation property has, for all  $2 \leq n \leq \omega$ ,  $\mathfrak{i}_n(B) \geq \aleph_1$ .*

*Proof.* Such a  $B$  is atomless, so let  $H \subseteq B^+$  be  $n$ -independent and countably infinite, that is  $H = \langle h_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ . Then let  $c_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \leq m} h_i$ . Each  $c_m$  is a finite sum of elements of  $H$ , thus by  $(\perp 1)$ ,  $c_m < 1$ . Then  $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{c_i : i \in \omega\}$  is a countable chain in  $B \setminus \{1\}$ , so by the strong countable separation property, there is a  $b \in B$  such that  $c_i \leq b < 1$  for all  $i \in \omega$ . Then as  $h_i \leq c_i$ ,  $h_i \leq b$  for all  $i \in \omega$  as well, that is,  $b$  is an upper bound for  $H$ . Thus by lemma 6.3,  $H$  is not maximal.  $\square$

In addition, we show that maximal  $n$ -independent sets lead to weakly dense sets.

We use the notation  $-X = \{-x : x \in X\}$  frequently in the sequel.

**Theorem 6.7.** *Let  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ . If  $X \subseteq A$  is maximal  $n$ -independent in  $A$ , then the set  $Y$  of nonzero elementary products of elements of  $X$  is weakly dense in  $A$ .*

Recall that  $Y$  is weakly dense in  $A$  if and only if  $Y \subseteq A^+$  and for every  $a \in A^+$ , there is a  $y \in Y$  such that  $y \leq a$  or  $y \leq -a$ .

*Proof.* If  $a \in X$ , this is trivial, so we may assume that  $a \notin X$  and hence  $X \cup \{a\}$  is not  $n$ -independent.

By proposition 1.7, there exist  $R \in [X \cup \{a\}]^{<\omega}$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$  while for every  $R' \in [R]^{\leq n}$ , if  $\varepsilon[R'] \subseteq \{1\}$  then  $\prod R' \neq 0$ . This last implication holds for every  $R' \in [R \setminus \{a\}]^{\leq n}$ , and so  $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \setminus \{a\}\} \neq 0$  since  $X$  is  $n$ -independent. But  $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \setminus \{a\}\} \leq a$  or  $\leq -a$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.8.** *If  $A$  is atomless and  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ , then  $\mathfrak{r}(A) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(A)$ .*

Recall the definition of the reaping number:

$$\mathfrak{r}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \{|X| : X \text{ is weakly dense in } A\}$$

*Proof.* Since  $A$  is atomless, all maximal  $n$ -independent sets are infinite, and thus there is a set of size  $\mathfrak{i}_n(A)$  weakly dense in  $A$ .  $\square$

We do not know if strict inequality is possible.

We do not currently have any results for the behavior of  $\mathfrak{i}_n$  on any type of product or its relationship to  $\mathfrak{u}$ .

We show the consistency of  $\mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) < \beth_1$  for  $1 \leq n \leq \omega$ . The argument is similar to exercises (A12) and (A13) in chapter VIII of Kunen [7]; the main lemma follows.

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $M$  be a countable transitive model of ZFC and  $1 \leq k \leq \omega$ . For a subset  $a$  of  $\omega$ , let  $[a]$  denote its equivalence class in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ . Suppose that  $\kappa$  is an infinite cardinal and  $\langle a_i : i < \kappa \rangle$  is a system of infinite subsets of  $\omega$  such that  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$  is  $k$ -independent in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ . Then there is a generic extension  $M[G]$  of  $M$  using a ccc partial order such that in  $M[G]$  there is a  $d \subseteq \omega$  with the following properties:*

- (1)  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \frown \langle [\omega \setminus d] \rangle$  is  $k$ -independent.
- (2) If

$$x \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap M) \setminus (\{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\omega \setminus d\}),$$

then

$$\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \frown \langle [\omega \setminus d], [x] \rangle$$

is not  $k$ -independent.

*Proof.* We work within  $M$  here.

Let  $B$  be the  $k$ -independent subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$  generated by  $\{[a_i] : i < \kappa\}$ . By Sikorski's extension criterion, let  $f$  be a homomorphism from  $\langle \{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\{m\} : m \in \omega\} \rangle$  to  $\overline{B}$  such that  $f(a_i) = [a_i]$  and  $f(\{m\}) = 0$ . Then let  $h : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \overline{B}$  be a homomorphic extension of  $f$  as given by Sikorski's extension theorem.

Let  $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(b, y) : b \in \ker(h) \text{ and } y \in [\omega]^{<\omega}\}$  with the partial order given by  $(b, y) \leq (b', y')$  if and only if  $b \supseteq b'$ ,  $y \supseteq y'$  and  $y \cap b' \subseteq y'$ . This is a ccc partial order. Let  $G$  be a  $P$ -generic filter over  $M$ , and let  $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{(b, y) \in G} y$ .

We now have several claims that combine to prove the lemma.

Claim 1. If  $R$  is a finite subset of  $\kappa$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  is such that  $\bigcap_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} a_i$  is infinite, then

$\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap d$  is infinite.

Let  $R$  and  $\varepsilon$  be as given, then for each  $n \in \omega$ , let

$$E_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (b, y) \in P : \exists m > n \left[ m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap y \right] \right\}.$$

First, we show that each  $E_n$  is dense. Take  $(b, y) \in P$ . Then  $c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\bigcap_{i \in R} (a_i^{\varepsilon_i})) \setminus b$  is infinite; if not, then  $c$  is finite (thus in  $\ker(h)$ , as is  $b$ ) and  $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \subseteq b \cup c$ . Applying  $h$  to both sides gives  $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$ , which is a contradiction of proposition 1.7. So we choose an  $m \in c \setminus y$  such that  $m > n$ ; then  $(b, y \cup \{m\}) \leq (b, y)$  and  $(b, y \cup \{m\}) \in E_n$ , showing that  $E_n$  is dense. This shows the claim, as for each  $n \in \omega$ ,  $E_n \cap G \neq \emptyset$ , so that we have an integer larger than  $n$  in  $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i \cap d$ .

Claim 2. If  $R$  is a finite subset of  $\kappa$  and  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$  such that  $\bigcap_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} a_i$  is infinite, then

$\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \setminus d$  is infinite.

Let  $R$  and  $\varepsilon$  be as given, then for each  $n \in \omega$ , let

$$D_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (b, y) \in P : \exists m > n \left[ m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap b \setminus y \right] \right\}.$$

To show that  $D_n$  is dense, take any  $(b, y) \in P$ . Since  $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i}$  is infinite from proposition 1.7, it follows that we may choose  $m > n$  such that  $m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \setminus y$ . Then  $(b \cup \{m\}, y) \leq (b, y)$  and  $(b \cup \{m\}, y) \in D_n$ , as desired.

Take some  $(b, y) \in D_n \cap G$ . Then there is an  $m > n$  such that  $m \notin d$  (thus proving the claim). In fact, choose  $m > n$  such that  $m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap b \setminus y$ . We claim that  $m \notin d$ . Suppose that  $m \in d$ ; then we have a  $(c, z) \in G$  with  $m \in z$  and  $(e, w) \in G$  that is a common extension of  $(b, y)$  and  $(c, z)$ . Then  $m \in w \cap b \setminus y$ , contradicting that  $(e, w) \leq (b, y)$ .

Claim 3.  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle^\wedge \langle [\omega \setminus d] \rangle$  is  $k$ -independent.

Suppose that  $R \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ ,  $\delta \in 2$ , and  $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} \cdot [\omega \setminus d]^\delta = 0$ . By claims 1 and 2 (depending on  $\delta$ ),  $\prod_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$ . Since  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$  is  $k$ -independent, there is a subset  $R' \subseteq \{i \in R : \varepsilon_i = 1\}$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $\prod_{i \in R'} [a_i] = 0$ , as desired.

Claim 4. If  $b \in \ker(h)$ , then  $b \cap d$  is finite.

$\{(c, y) \in P : b \subseteq c\}$  is dense in  $P$ , so that there is a  $(c, y) \in G$  such that  $b \subseteq c$ . We show  $b \cap d \subseteq y$  and thus is finite. Let  $m \in b \cap d$  and choose an

$(e, z) \in G$  such that  $m \in z$ . Let  $(r, w) \in G$  be a common extension of  $(e, z)$  and  $(c, y)$ ; then (recalling the definition of the order)  $m \in w \cap c \subseteq y$ .

Claim 5. If

$$x \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap M) \setminus (\{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\omega \setminus d\}),$$

then

$$s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \frown \langle [\omega \setminus d], [x] \rangle$$

is not  $k$ -independent.

We have two cases here. The slightly easier is if  $x \in \ker(h)$ ; then by claim 4,  $x \cap d$  is finite, so that  $[x] \leq [\omega \setminus d]$ , causing  $s$  to fail to even be ideal-independent. If  $x \notin \ker(h)$ , then there is a  $b \in B$  with  $0 < b \leq h(x)$ . Since  $B$  is  $k$ -freely generated by  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$ , we may take  $b$  to be a elementary product of elements of  $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$ . Then  $b = [c]$ , where  $c = \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i}$  is infinite. Then  $c \setminus x \in \ker(h)$ . By claim 4, this gives  $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} \cdot -[x] \cdot [d] = 0$ , contradicting proposition 1.7 for  $s$ . □

**Theorem 6.10.** *For each  $1 \leq k \leq \omega$ , it is consistent with  $\beth_1 > \aleph_1$  that  $\mathfrak{i}_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \aleph_1$ .*

*Proof.* We begin with a countable transitive model  $M$  of  $ZFC + \beth_1 > \aleph_1$ , then iterate the construction of lemma 6.9  $\omega_1$  times as in lemma 5.14 of chapter VIII of Kunen [7]. This results in a model of  $ZFC + \beth_1 > \aleph_1 + \mathfrak{i}_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \aleph_1$ . □

This shows that  $\mathfrak{i}_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \beth_1$  is independent of  $ZFC$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bell, M.: The space of complete subgraphs of a graph. *Comm. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **23**(3), 525–536 (1982)
- [2] Bell, M.G.: Polyadic spaces of arbitrary compactness numbers. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **26**(2), 353–361 (1985)
- [3] Bell, M.G., van Mill, J.: The compactness number of a compact topological space. I. *Fund. Math.* **106**(3), 163–173 (1980)
- [4] Heindorf, L.: Chains in Boolean semigroup algebras. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.* **37**(1), 93–96 (1991)
- [5] Heindorf, L.: Graph spaces and  $\perp$ -free boolean algebras. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **121**, 657–665 (1994)
- [6] Koppelberg, S.: *General theory of Boolean algebras*, pp. xix + 312l. North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (1989)
- [7] Kunen, K.: *Set theory, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, vol. 102. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1980). An introduction to independence proofs
- [8] Monk, J.D.: Cardinal invariants on Boolean algebras, *Progress in Mathematics*, vol. 142. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (1996)
- [9] Monk, J.D.: Continuum cardinals generalized to Boolean algebras. *J. Symbolic Logic* **66**(4), 1928–1958 (2001)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER,  
800 W. MAIN STREET, WHITEWATER, WI 53190, USA

*E-mail address:* [brunsc@uwv.edu](mailto:brunsc@uwv.edu)

*URL:* <http://facstaff.uww.edu/brunsc>